



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/960,180	09/20/2001	Makarand P. Gore	10012215-1	4586

7590 08/20/2004
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

ACKUN, JACOB K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3712

DATE MAILED: 08/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/960,180

Applicant(s)

GORE ET AL.

Examiner

Jacob K. Ackun Jr.

Art Unit

3712

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08).
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Art Unit: 3712

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The limitation that the inner casing is coupled to the outer casing to form an integrated device was not described in the disclosure as filed and thus constitutes New Matter. The limitation also does not meet the written description requirement because it is not clear from the specification what the applicant intends by "an integrated device".

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not clear precisely what structure is encompassed by the requirement that the inner and outer containers form an "integrated device".

Furthermore, with respect to claims 1-19 the claims are indefinite because it is not clear whether the applicant intends to claim only the subcombination of the protective container or the combination of the protective container and material contained therein. This in turn is because portions of the claims indicate that what is claimed is the subcombination (note line 1 of claim 1 for example only), while other portions indicate that what is claimed is the combination (note the

Art Unit: 3712

last line of claim 1 for example only, wherein the preventative agent is further expressly limited by reference to the material. In another example only note the express limitations on the material in dependent claims 5 and 6 to colored and etiological materials respectively). Clarification of the scope of the claims is required. For example only, if it is the applicant's intention to claim the combination then line 1 of each of the product claims should clearly so indicate. In this office action it is presumed that the product claims are drawn to the subcombination of the container only, in order to give the claims their broadest reasonable interpretation per the applicable Rules. Accordingly all references in the claims to any material are considered only as statements of intended use with regard to the claimed container. Moreover since no product claim structurally requires any material no reference applied in a rejection against any product claim is required to show any material. Any such material in a reference so applied against any of the product claims is merely coincidental.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Haigh et al (3,999,653 cited by the applicant). The claimed inner casing reads on bottle 12 and the claimed outer casing reads on portions of the package external to the inner casing, such as the outer wall of jacket 17 and/or outer jacket 26 and/or packaging 72, 73, 75 and 76 in the embodiment of Fig

Art Unit: 3712

8. In the embodiment of Fig 1, the inner casing is considered to be less durable than the outer casing since the inner casing broke when impacted by the hammer while the outer casing was intact (note the description in column 8 lines 27+). The inner casing of Haigh is considered to be coupled to the outer casing to form an integrated device to the extent the requirement can be understood, and since they can in any event be described as being “integrated”.

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hacikyan (6,530,472). Hacikyan discloses most of the elements of the claims, but may not disclose the claimed difference in durability between the outer and inner containers. However Hacikyan teaches that the word vial used to refer to inner casing 108 can be “any storage unit for liquid substances”, and storage units for liquid substances that are less durable than the shipping container disclosed in the reference are conventional. It would have been obvious in view of the above, to construct the inner casing 108 of Hacikyan from materials such that the inner casing was less durable than the outer casing, as a design expedient, or in order to provide a more cost effective container, for example, depending on the particular substance to be placed in the inner casing.

9. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kreutz et al (4, 213, 528), Shantz et al (4,948,642) and Hacikyan (5,984,087). With regard to Kreutz inner container 15 is considered to be less durable than outer container 11, since unlike the outer


Art Unit: 3712

container, the inner container could shatter or break. With regard to Shantz the inner container is the inner layer and the outer container the outer layer. Note the disclosed materials for the "less durable" requirement. Similarly, the inner container 30 of Hacikyan is considered to be less durable than the outer container (in this case the outer container can be the outer layer 12 constructed of wood or plastic as taught in the reference). In all cases the inner and outer casings are considered to be coupled together to form an "integrated device".

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob K. Ackun Jr. whose telephone number is (703)308-3867. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8.30AM-5.00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on (703)308-1745. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jacob K. Ackun Jr.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3712

J.A.